

and I would like to say, in closing our argument. I do think that we did the best we could do on this bill. Let me say to the pro-life people, I resisted tremendous pressure from the Democratic side several years ago to put language in the bill which would have allowed abortions overseas. We did not put that language in our bill because we thought that would be inappropriate. We thought the pro-life position was the right position and we resisted that position.

I would hope the Members would take that into consideration. It sounds like we need a medic here to save this bill because everybody is talking negative. I think we have a good bill. I think we have a bill that is as good as we can get, and I hope we will be able to convince the White House to sign the bill when it finally gets to them. I would urge the Members to vote for a reasonable defense bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

This is a very, very difficult position, I think, for many of us on the pro-life side to be in. Let me make it very clear why many pro-life Members of Congress oppose this conference report. We do not contend that supporters of the report are necessarily pro-abortion. Indeed, the opposite is true: the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member are very pro-life. But sadly, the fact of the matter is that this is a pro-abortion bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted to prohibit abortions in our military hospitals. The conference report will allow abortions in these hospitals for any reason whatsoever without limitation. Members of Congress who ordinarily vote against abortion can support this legislation if, and only if, they have not read the language carefully or, perhaps, if they have other priorities that come before the unborn child.

How important are the lives of these children that would be put at risk if this conference report were to be enacted into law? If your life or mine, I say to my friends, if your life or mine were at risk or in jeopardy of being either chemically poisoned or killed by a dismemberment, or by a suction machine, would voting down this conference report be so difficult to do?

I would suggest and submit that we all know that eventually a conference report will be passed, or perhaps as part of a CR we will fund the Department of Defense. It is a matter of when. It is not a matter of if.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out to Members that the Dornan language is carried over in this bill, but then there is gutting language. One person referred to it as a "caveat." It completely and totally negates the operative section of the Dornan language.

Let me also remind Members that all of the pro-life groups—the Christian Coalition, the National Right to Life Committee—reluctantly but, nevertheless firmly, have come down and asked for a no vote on this DOD conference report.

It is a very difficult situation for all of us to be in. I do not like it, nobody likes it, but if we want to save the unborn, if we want to save them from the cruelty of abortion, a no vote is the only way to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 1¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has one speaker remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that I think Members have given ample reason for opposing the bill in general. I would also urge that they support the motion to recommit for the simple reason that it prevents a \$31 million ripoff of the taxpayers to the United States, a ripoff which will enrich a few corporate directors while the workers of that same company are being laid off.

I do not think that is a proposition any of us can go home and explain to any of our constituents, and I do not think we should even try. So I would urge the adoption of the recommittal motion and the defeat of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 698]

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Coyne	Ewing	LaTourette	Rivers
Allard	Brown (OH)	Cramer	Farr	Laughlin	Roberts
Andrews	Brownback	Crane	Fattah	Lazio	Roemer
Archer	Bryant (TN)	Crapo	Fawell	Leach	Rohrabacher
Armey	Bryant (TX)	Creameans	Fazio	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Bachus	Bunn	Cubin	Fields (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Baessler	Bunning	Cunningham	Filner	Lewis (GA)	Roth
Baker (CA)	Burr	Danner	Flake	Lewis (KY)	Roukema
Baker (LA)	Burton	Davis	Flanagan	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard
Baldacci	Buyer	de la Garza	Foglietta	Lincoln	Royce
Ballenger	Calvert	Deal	Foley	Linder	Rush
Barcia	Camp	DeFazio	Forbes	Lipinski	Sabo
Barr	Canady	DeLauro	Ford	Livingston	Salmon
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Diaz-Balart	Fowler	LoBiondo	Sanders
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Dickey	Fox	Lofgren	Sanford
Bartlett	Chabot	Dicks	Franks (CT)	Longley	Sawyer
Barton	Chambliss	Dingell	Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Saxton
Bass	Chapman	Dixon	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Scarborough
Bateman	Chenoweth	Doggett	Frisa	Luther	Schaefer
Becerra	Christensen	Dooley	Funderburk	Maloney	Schiff
Beilenson	Christy	Doolittle	Furse	Manton	Schroeder
Bentsen	Chryslers	Dornan	Galleghy	Manzullo	Schumer
Bereuter	Clay	Doyle	Ganske	Markey	Scott
Bevill	Clayton	Dreier	Gejdenson	Martinez	Seastrand
Bilbray	Clement	Duncan	Gekas	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Bilirakis	Clinger	Dunn	Gephardt	Mascara	Serrano
Bishop	Clyburn	Durbin	Geren	Matsui	Shadegg
Bliley	Coble	Edwards	Gilchrest	McCarthy	Shaw
Blute	Coburn	Ehlers	Gillmor	McCollum	Shays
Boehlert	Coleman	Ehrlich	Gonzalez	McCrery	Shuster
Boehner	Collins (GA)	Emerson	Goodlatte	McDade	Sisisky
Bonilla	Collins (MI)	Engel	Goodling	McDermott	Skaggs
Bono	Combest	English	Gordon	McHale	Skeen
Borski	Condit	Ensign	Goss	McInnis	Skelton
Boucher	Conyers	Eshoo	Graham	McIntosh	Slaughter
Brewster	Cooley	Evans	Green	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Browder	Costello	Everett	Greenwood	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
	Cox		Gunderson	McNulty	Smith (TX)
			Gutierrez	Meehan	Smith (WA)
			Gutknecht	Meek	Solomon
			Hall (OH)	Menendez	Souder
			Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Spence
			Hancock	Meyers	Spratt
			Hansen	Mfume	Stearns
			Harman	Mica	Stenholm
			Hastert	Miller (CA)	Stockman
			Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stokes
			Hastings (WA)	Mineta	Studds
			Hayes	Minge	Stump
			Hayworth	Mink	Stupak
			Hefley	Molinari	Talent
			Hefner	Mollohan	Tanner
			Heineman	Montgomery	Tate
			Herger	Moorhead	Tauzin
			Hillery	Moran	Taylor (MS)
			Hilliard	Morella	Taylor (NC)
			Hinchey	Murtha	Thomas
			Hobson	Myers	Thornberry
			Hoekstra	Myrick	Thornton
			Hoke	Nadler	Thurman
			Holden	Neal	Tiahrt
			Horn	Nethercutt	Torkildsen
			Hostettler	Neumann	Torres
			Houghton	Ney	Torricelli
			Hunter	Norwood	Towns
			Hutchinson	Nussle	Traficant
			Hyde	Oberstar	Upton
			Inglis	Obey	Velazquez
			Istook	Olver	Vento
			Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Visclosky
			Jefferson	Orton	Volkmer
			Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Vucanovich
			Johnson (SD)	Packard	Waldholtz
			Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Walsh
			Johnson, Sam	Parker	Wamp
			Johnston	Pastor	Ward
			Jones	Paxon	Waters
			Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Watt (NC)
			Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Watts (OK)
			Kasich	Pelosi	Weldon (FL)
			Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
			Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Weller
			Kennedy (RI)	Petri	White
			Kennelly	Pickett	Whitfield
			Kildee	Pommo	Wicker
			Kim	Pomeroy	Williams
			King	Portman	Wise
			Kingston	Poshard	Wolf
			Kleczka	Pryce	Woolsey
			Klink	Quinn	Wyden
			Klug	Radanovich	Wynn
			Knollenberg	Rahall	Yates
			Kolbe	Ramstad	Young (AK)
			LaFalce	Rangel	Young (FL)
			LaHood	Reed	Zeliff
			Lantos	Regula	Zimmer
			Largent	Richardson	
			Latham	Riggs	

□ 1408

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). On this rollcall, 403 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my being involved in an event at the White House prevented me from voting on rollcall No. 698, a quorum call. Had I been able to vote I would have voted "present."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if this bill goes down, what does he think the next one is going to look like?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the problem, as I see it, is, we had over 2000 suggestions and recommendations to the bill. Obviously, we had to make a judgment on each of those recommendations as we went through the bill. Certainly, it would be a problem because as it gets involved in negotiations, there will be less of everything available. So there is no question in my mind, that there will be some substantial changes in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. There was some clapping when the gentleman said that. Some Members believe that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said is a good thing. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] spoke against the bill. He thinks that there is too much spending. The gentleman, various other folks on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle have spoken against the bill for various reasons.

We got a letter here from Alice Rivlin, dated today, saying the President of the United States is going to veto this bill because it is too much spending. I know that that represents a large sentiment in the minority, the minority.

My colleagues, I address these comments to my friends on this side, we are the majority. We have been elected to set the agenda. One of the planks in the Contract With America was to provide for a strong national defense.

Now, there are those among us who came to Congress with one issue or two issues in mind that had nothing whatsoever to do with the strong national defense. And I agree with them on those issues. Some want to balance the budget. Some believe that the protection of innocent life is the most important thing in this world. I agree with them. I have got a 100 percent pro-life record. But I also think that we as elected Members of the House of Representatives have the responsibility to represent our mutual constituents. We have the responsibility of representing every live: man, woman and child in our districts, every man, woman and child in America. Under the Constitution of the United States, one of our primary, if not our primary, responsibilities is to provide for an adequate defense for this Nation.

The House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations have met in conference and we have produced a conference report in bipartisan fashion which provides for not only an adequate defense but for a better defense than the President of the United States was prepared to provide if his numbers had governed.

Last year in the rose garden in front of the White House, the President of the United States, surrounded by people with medals of all sorts, his Joint Chiefs of Staff, said his plan to reduce the military, the pentagon, had gone so far that he was \$25 billion short, short in his plans to protect the sanctity of the United States to provide for the national defense. And, therefore, he was going to recommend that we spend \$25 billion more.

Guess what? The check never arrived. It never came. In his budget proposal in February, he provided for spending on defense of \$7 billion less than last year, \$7 billion less than last year.

This conference committee, in conjunction with the Senate, said, no, Mr. President. We are going to hold you to your promise. We are going to provide exactly, not more, not less, but exactly what we provided last year. We are going to stem the flow. We realize that defense has been the scapegoat for every domestic program on earth for 11 straight years, that for the last 11 years procurement has gone down by almost 75 percent, that in real terms, spending on defense has gone down by nearly 30 percent, and that it is time to stand up for the young men and women in uniform in this country and provide the basic services, the basic maintenance, the basic operations, the basic training that they need to do their job.

□ 1415

Now the President of the United States, the President of the United States, may well come to us in a few weeks and say he wants to send 25,000, or any number, of troops to Bosnia, and some of my colleagues want to put a preemption in there and say, "No, Mr. President, you can't do that." I suggest to my colleagues that we can do that,

that he must come to Congress, that he cannot ignore us, but to take the unheard-of-step, unconstitutional step, of binding him before he has taken that action, is to play in the hands of the foolish of the world who believe that it is in the best interest of the pacifists of the world to simply bind the President in future events. How in the world can we really seriously say that no matter what happens in this world, no matter how much more peaceful in this world the President can make Europe by helping Bosnia, that we are going to cut it off today without knowing what is going to happen tomorrow and that under no circumstances can we put 10 troops in Bosnia, let alone 25,000?

Let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us not unconstitutionally bind the President of the United States. Let us pass a good defense bill, even with last year. Let us not get hung up on pro-life issues that are important to all of us who are pro-life, but let us not forget that our first responsibility is to provide for an adequate national defense for every man, woman, and child in America today.

This is a good bill. Pass it.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I stand before this House and offer a pledge of allegiance. However, unlike the pledge we take each morning, this pledge of allegiance is to those who are not yet born.

Simply said, I pledge allegiance to the right to life.

My belief in the right to life is not debatable, it is not contestable, it is not even open to discussion. It is an issue that simply offers no compromise and yet, today we face a dilemma.

That dilemma surrounds our vote on the 1996 Department of Defense Appropriations Act conference report. That report contains a provision that prohibits funds from being made available to perform abortions at DOD medical facilities only if specifically authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act. The Appropriations Committee has now placed a burden of responsibility squarely on the shoulders of those on the authorization committee.

Well, I accept that responsibility. And as I cast my vote for the appropriations conference report, I clearly understand that I must work hard to make certain the 1996 DOD authorization language directs that those facilities will not be used for abortions. At the same time, a vote for the appropriations conference report is a vote of support for our national defense and the needs of our Nation's military.

The correct forum to fight the battle against performing abortions in DOD facilities is in the authorization conference committee. As such, I encourage my colleagues to support the appropriations conference report.

Vote today for the conference report but I implore each and everyone in this chamber to support the design of language that prohibits this unacceptable procedure in our 1996 Defense Authorization Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the conference report accompanying H.R. 2126, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. My colleagues, this conference agreement appropriates a total of \$243.3 billion for defense programs—\$6.9 billion more than the administration's request